



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

receive if he (still unchangeably A.) were in B.'s situation. Voilà la comédie humaine—tragique! For B., having achieved his *ius* as he himself defines it proceeds then to deal with C. (who agrees with neither A. nor B.) in precisely the same spirit in which A. has dealt with him. Few, indeed, have been the successful rebels against constraint who have not in turn been eager to constrain. But literature, which is the mirror of life and therefore of man's infinite variety, will yet with the help of philosophy and history—for the help of these two disciplines is indispensable for the full comprehension of the portrayal—make it clear to every open mind that the individual does not and can not acquiesce in another's definition of his *ius*, and that in the future control must be exercised rather over the conditions amid which he develops his personality than over this development itself. For personality can no more be permanently enchained than could Proteus of old.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

NELSON GLENN MCCREA.

REVIEW

A Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Mythology. Edited by H. B. Walters. 580 Illustrations. Cambridge: at the University Press (1916). \$6.00.

Although the number of Classical Dictionaries in the various languages which serious students of the Classics are supposed to be able to use is already a large one, there is always room for a good manual of the kind, of moderate compass, in English. The one before us is about as brief as a work covering so wide a range of subjects can reasonably be expected to be, it is well printed, and it is handsomely and adequately illustrated.

The only real test of such a book is actual use and the reviewer has therefore kept a copy at his elbow for some weeks and has consulted it frequently. He has found it on the whole very satisfactory and he offers a list of criticisms primarily as evidence of good faith, to show that his review is not based upon a perfunctory examination.

The marking of the Latin quantities is erratic; at least the reviewer can discover no principle on which long vowels are marked or left unmarked. *Italia* is surely wrong, if we recognize Quintilian as an authority. If *villicus* is to be written (the spelling is wrong and the quantity dubious with that orthography), why not *villa*, *lūstrum*, *tēcta*, etc.?

One might fairly ask that readers of Horace should have their needs met by a book of this kind, but one looks in vain for *oenophorus* (Serm. 1.6.109; see

American Journal of Archaeology 13.30 ff.), for *larva* as a mask (Serm. 1.5. 64), for Tigellius, and for *quinquevir* (Serm. 2.5.56). Those whose reading goes farther will miss *essedarius* in the sense of a kind of gladiator, the various metaphorical uses of *canis*, *pulvinar* in the meaning seen in Suetonius, Augustus 45.1 and Claudius 4.3, *Latinitas* as a quality of style, and *inferiae*. The last word, strangely enough, does not appear in Marquardt's Index, although it finds a place in that of Volume 4 of Müller's Handbuch. It may well be (in some cases is) the fact that these words are mentioned incidentally, as is *cryptoporticus* under *crypta*, but some at least are important enough to be given a special heading, even though only a cross-reference be added.

Naturally, not all the articles are of equal merit. That on Satura seems especially defective; the Menippean satire is not mentioned at all (nor is Menippus) and Petronius does not belong in the list of satirists. The same general criticism may be passed upon the article *cursus honorum*, while to make *libertina* synonymous with *helaera* seems rather of the nature of a slander. The description and the representation of the *cotylus* (*cotyla*) are exceedingly dubious; see Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 2.89 ff. To say that Suetonius's "other works <than the De Vita Caesarum> are all lost" is a slight exaggeration, seeing that their remains, with the translation, occupy over a hundred pages in the Loeb Library.

We all have our 'taboos' and the reviewer is moved to such wrath by designations like "G. Iulius Caesar" and that ilk, that he begs for space to say a word or two on a subject some aspects of which seem to be neglected in our books of reference. We all know that C. and Cn. stood for Gaius and Gnaeus, but G. and Gn. never became good usage. In Ricci's excellent little handbook the former is relegated to the provinces, from the second century onward. One therefore shies at "G. Suetonius Tranquillus", "G. Plinius", etc., in a book of this class. The English translation of C. Iulius Caesar is Gaius Julius Caesar, and to the reviewer "C. Caesar" and "M. Cicero" are an abomination in an English rendering. They do not occur in this Dictionary, but that they are tolerated in our Schools seems evident from the number of students who habitually use such expressions and by the growing number of those who actually do not know for what the abbreviations stand; *experto crede*. Consistency in the use of the forms proper to Latin and to English respectively is not easy, although it is child's play compared with a similar consistency in pronunciation, but it should be observed at least by scholars and by teachers.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

JOHN C. ROLFE.